

Application No.: 09/922,046

Docket No.: JCLA6385-R

**REMARKS****Present Status of the Application**

The Non-Final Office Action rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, because of new matter issue. Claim 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Horan et al. (US patent number 5,892,964, hereafter "Horan"). Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 4-6, 10 and 12 remain pending in the present application. More specifically, claims 1, 4-6, 10 and 12 are directly amended; claims 2-3, 7-9, 11 and 13-15 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter. It is believed that the foregoing amendments add no new matter to the present application. Reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

**Discussion of Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph.

Applicant amended claims 1, 4-6, 10 and 12 to overcome the rejections. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

Applicants wish to clarify that the foregoing amendments have been made for purposes of better defining the invention in response to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and not in response to the rejections made based on prior art. Indeed, Applicants

Application No.: 09/922,046

Docket No.: JCLA6385-R

submit that no substantive limitations have been added to the claims. Therefore, no prosecution history estoppel arises from these amendments. Applicants believe that these amendments place the claims in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

**Discussion of Claim Rejection under 35 USC 102**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being under anticipated by Horan. Applicant respectfully transverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 1, as amended, states:

1. An extended bus structure, coupling with a control chip set via a first accelerated graphics port bus, the extended bus structure comprising:

a first extended bus for expanding the first accelerated graphics port bus;

a second accelerated graphics port bus for expanding the first accelerated graphics port bus; and

a first bridge, coupled to the control chip set via the first accelerated graphics port bus and further coupled to the second accelerated graphics port bus and the first extended bus for converting mutually and compatibly signal and data between the first and second accelerated graphics port buses and the first extended bus, wherein the first accelerated graphics port bus is at lest expanded into the first extended bus and the first and second accelerated graphics port buses. (with emphasis)

Application No.: 09/922,046

Docket No.: JCLA6385-R

Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that Horan does not disclose, teach, or suggest the features that are highlighted in claim 1 above. More specifically, in page 3 of this Office Action, Horan disclosed a core logic chip 104 comprises a bridge, or in column 9 line 65 to column 10 line 4 of Horan, a core logic chip implements a bridge. However, in claim 1 of this application, the first bridge is independent from and not built in the control chip set. The bridge in Horan is built in or implemented by the core logic 104, but the bridge in claim 1 is a bridge between the first and second accelerated graphics port buses and the first extended bus. Besides, Horan does not disclose a first accelerated graphics port bus is at least expanded into first and second extended bus and first and second accelerated graphics port buses. Thus, Horan does not anticipate claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

If independent claim 1 is allowable over Horan, then its dependent claims 4-6 are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent claim 10, as amended, states:

10. A bridge converting signals between a first and second accelerated graphics port buses and a first extended bus, comprising:
  - a main accelerated graphics port controller coupled to the first accelerated graphics port bus for compatibly receiving and transmitting data and signal thereof;

Application No.: 09/922,046

Docket No.: JCLA6385-R

a first extended bus controller coupled to the first extended bus for compatibly receiving and transmitting data and signal thereof;

an extended accelerated graphics port controller coupled to the second accelerated graphics port bus for compatibly receiving and transmitting data and signal of the second accelerated graphics port bus; and

a flow controller coupled between the main and the extended accelerated graphics port controllers and the first extended bus controller for arbitrating and controlling flow direction of data and signal into/from the main and the extended accelerated graphics port controllers and the first extended bus controller. (with emphasis)

Independent claim 10 is allowable for at least the reason that Horan does not disclose, teach, or suggest the features that are highlighted in claim 10 above. More specially, in FIG. 3 of Horan, the arbiter 216 is coupled to buses 302 and 304, but not coupled between the AGP controller 210b and the AGP/PCI logic 218a. In claim 10, the flow controller is coupled between the main and extended accelerated graphics port controllers and the first extended bus controller. Therefore, the flow controller in claim 10 is different from the arbiter in Horan. Thus, Horan does not anticipate claim 10, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

If independent claim 10 is allowable over Horan, then its dependent claim 12 are allowable as a matter of law, because the dependent claim contain all features of the respective independent claim 10.

Application No.: 09/922,046

Docket No.: JCLA6385-R


**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1, 4-6, 10 and 12 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Date: 3/21/2005

4 Venture, Suite 250  
Irvine, CA 92618  
Tel.: (949) 660-0761  
Fax: (949)-660-0809  
E-mail: jcpi@email.msn.com

Respectfully submitted,  
J.C. PATENTS

  
Jiawei Huang  
Registration No. 43,330